



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,407	08/06/2003	Constance Berghs	21402-647 (Cura-947)	8484

7590 04/18/2006

Jenell Lawson
Intellectual Property
CuraGen Corporation
555 Long Wharf Drive
New Haven, CT 06551

EXAMINER

CALAMITA, HEATHER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1637

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/635,407	Applicant(s) BERGHS ET AL.	
	Examiner Heather G. Calamita, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-2, drawn to an isolated nucleic acid molecule, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
 - II. Claims 3-10, drawn to an isolated polypeptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
 - III. Claims 11-30, drawn to a method for identifying compounds that modulate target polypeptide activity, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
 - IV. Claims 31-34, drawn to an antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.
 - V. Claim 35, drawn to a method for identifying a potential therapeutic, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
 - VI. Claim 36, drawn to a method for screening for a modulator of activity, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

Inventions I, II and IV are patentably distinct products.

The polypeptide of group II and polynucleotide of group I are patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons. Polypeptides, which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of purine and pyrimidine units, are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. In the present claims, a polynucleotide of group I does not necessarily encode a polypeptide of group II. The information provided by the polynucleotide of group I can be used to make a materially different

Art Unit: 1637

polypeptide than that of group II. For example, a nucleic acid which hybridizes to SEQ ID NO: 1, even under stringent conditions, encompasses molecules which contain point mutations, splice sites, frameshift mutations or stop codons which would result in use of a different open reading frame, and thus encode a protein that lacks any significant structure in common with SEQ ID NO. 2. In addition, while a polypeptide of group II can be made by methods using some, but not all, of the polynucleotides that fall within the scope of group I, it can also be recovered from a natural source using biochemical means. For instance, the polypeptide can be isolated using affinity chromatography. For these reasons, the inventions of groups I and II are patentably distinct.

Furthermore, searching the inventions of groups I and II together would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, the search of the polypeptides and the polynucleotides are not coextensive. The inventions of Groups I and II have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. In cases such as this one where descriptive sequence information is provided, the sequences are searched in appropriate databases. There is search burden also in the non-patent literature. Prior to the concomitant isolation and expression of the sequence of interest there may be journal articles devoted solely to polypeptides which would not have described the polynucleotide. Similarly, there may have been "classical" genetics papers which had no knowledge of the polypeptide but spoke to the gene. Searching, therefore is not coextensive. In addition, the polypeptide claims include polypeptides having 70% identity to the sequence identified. This search requires an extensive analysis of the art retrieved in a sequence search and will require an in-depth analysis of technical literature. The scope of polynucleotides as claimed extend beyond the polynucleotide that encodes the claimed polypeptides as explained above; furthermore, a search of the nucleic acid molecules of claim 20 would require an oligonucleotide search, which is not likely to result in relevant art with respect to the polypeptide of group II. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of groups I and II together.

Art Unit: 1637

The polypeptide of group II and the antibody of group IV are patentably distinct for the following reasons:

While the inventions of both group II and group IV are polypeptides, in this instance the polypeptide of group II is a single chain molecule, whereas the polypeptide of group IV encompasses antibodies including IgG which comprises 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, and including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementarity determining regions (CDRs) that function to bind an epitope. Thus the polypeptide of group II and the antibody of group IV are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polypeptide of group II and an antibody of group IV is dependent upon the correlation between the scope of the polypeptides that the antibody binds and the scope of the antibodies that would be generated upon immunization with the polypeptide.

Searching the inventions of group II and group IV would impose a serious search burden. The inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. A polypeptide and an antibody which binds to the polypeptide require different searches. An amino acid sequence search of the full-length protein is necessary for a determination of novelty and unobviousness of the protein. However, such a search is not required to identify the antibodies of group IV. Furthermore, antibodies which bind to an epitope of a polypeptide of group I may be known even if a polypeptide of group II is novel. The technical literature search for the polypeptide of group II and the antibody of group IV are not coextensive, e.g., antibodies may be characterized in the technical literature prior to discovery of or sequence of their binding target.

The polynucleotide of group I and the antibody of group IV are patentably distinct for the following reasons. The antibody of group IV includes, for example, IgG molecules which comprise 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, and including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementarity determining regions (CDRs). Polypeptides, such as the

Art Unit: 1637

antibody of group IV which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of nucleic acids, are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. In the present claims, a polynucleotide of group I will not encode an antibody of group IV, and the antibody of group IV cannot be encoded by a polynucleotide of group I. Therefore the antibody and polynucleotide are patentably distinct.

The antibody and polynucleotide inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Furthermore, searching the inventions of group I and group IV would impose a serious search burden since a search of the polynucleotide of group I is would not be used to determine the patentability of an antibody of group IV, and vice-versa.

Inventions III, V, VI, are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). The instant specification does not disclose that these methods would be used together. The method for modulating the activity of a polypeptide (group III), the method for identifying a therapeutic agent (group V) and the method for screening for a modulator of activity (group VI) are all unrelated as they comprise distinct steps and utilize different products which demonstrates that each method has a different mode of operation. Each invention performs this function using a structurally and functionally divergent material. Moreover, the methodology and materials necessary for execution of these methods differ significantly for each of the materials and therefore, each method is divergent in materials and steps. The method for modulating the activity of a polypeptide (group III) involves combining a test compound and a target polypeptide and determining if the test compound modulates the activity and does not involve administering the compound to an animal. The method for screening for a modulator of activity (group VI) involves administering a test compound to an

Art Unit: 1637

animal. The method for identifying a therapeutic agent (group V) involves contacting cells with a composition having the test compound and does not involve an animal model. For these reasons the Inventions III, V, VI are patentably distinct. Furthermore, the distinct steps and products require separate and distinct searches and as such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of Groups III, V, VI together.

Inventions II and (III, V, VI) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptides of group II can be used in a variety of methods such as the variety of methods claimed in the instant application in groups III, V, VI.

Searching the inventions of Groups II and (III, V, VI) together would impose serious search burden. The inventions of Groups II and (III, V, VI) have a separate status in the art and in the instant case, the search for the polypeptides and their methods of use are not coextensive. Group II encompasses molecules which are claimed in terms of identity in regard to reference sequence SEQ ID NO 2, which are not required for the search of Group (III, V, VI). In contrast, the search for group (III, V, VI) would require a text search for the methods of use encompassed by these groups in addition to an amino acid search of the SEQ ID NOs. Prior art which teaches a polypeptide that is 95% identical to the SEQ ID NOs of claim 2 would not necessarily be applicable to the method of using the polypeptides of those SEQ ID NOs. Moreover, even if the polypeptide product were known, the methods of using the product may be novel and unobvious in view of the preamble or active steps.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a

Art Unit: 1637

materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polynucleotides of group I can be used to make recombinant proteins as opposed to its use in a variety of methods such as the variety of methods claimed in the instant application in group III.

Searching the inventions of Groups I and III together would impose serious search burden. The inventions of Groups I and III have a separate status in the art and in the instant case, the search for the polynucleotides and their methods of use are not coextensive. The search for group III would require a text search for the method steps of the methods of use in addition to an oligonucleotide search the SEQ ID NOs of claim 1. Prior art which teaches a SEQ ID NO of claim 1 would not necessarily be applicable to the method of using the polynucleotide. Moreover, even if the polynucleotide product were known, the method of diagnosis using the product may be novel and unobvious in view of the preamble or active steps.

Sequence Election Requirement Applicable to All Groups

2. In addition, each Group detailed above reads on patentably distinct Groups drawn to multiple SEQ ID Numbers. The sequences are patentably distinct because they are unrelated sequences, and a further restriction is applied to each Group. Furthermore, the sequence searching in multiple expansive databases has put undue burden on the examiner and office resources. For an elected Group drawn to amino acid sequences, the Applicants must further elect a single amino acid sequence. For an elected Group drawn to nucleotide sequences, the Applicants are permitted to elect a single nucleic acid sequence (See MPEP 803.04).

MPEP 803.04 states:

Nucleotide sequences encoding different proteins are structurally distinct chemical compounds and are unrelated to one another. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such nucleotide sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to a restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 CFR 1.141 et seq. Nevertheless, to further aid the biotechnology industry in protecting its intellectual property without creating an undue burden on the Office, the Commissioner has decided sua sponte to partially waive the requirements of 37 CFR 1.141 et seq. and permit a reasonable number of such nucleotide sequences to be claimed in a single application. See Examination of Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequences, 1192 O.G. 68 (November 19, 1996).

Art Unit: 1637

It has been determined that normally ten sequences constitute a reasonable number for examination purposes. Accordingly, in most cases, one independent and distinct nucleotide sequence will be examined in a single application without restriction. In addition to the specifically selected sequence, those sequences which are patentably indistinct from the selected sequences will also be examined. Furthermore, nucleotide sequences encoding the same protein are not considered to be independent and distinct inventions and will continue to be examined together.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the search required for each group is not required for the other groups because each group requires a different non-patent literature search due to each group comprising different products and/or method steps, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to

Art Unit: 1637

rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Correspondence

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather G. Calamita whose telephone number is 571.272.2876 and whose e-mail address is heather.calamita@uspto.gov. However, the office cannot guarantee security through the e-mail system nor should official papers be transmitted through this route. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached at 571.272.0782.

Papers related to this application may be faxed to Group 1637 via the PTO Fax Center using the fax number 571.273.8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to 571.272.0547.


Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is

Art Unit: 1637

a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

hgc



JEFFREY FREDMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

3/7/06